



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,253	01/21/2004	Kia Silverbrook	MPA15US	1566
24011 7590 04/08/2008 SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA				
			EXAMINER	
			MARTIN, LAURA E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2853	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/760,253

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

LAURA E. MARTIN

Art Unit

2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/14/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook et al. (6439908) in view of Silverbrook (US 20020180834).

Silverbrook et al. (908) disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: a printhead assembly (figure 2, element 10) comprising: at least two printhead integrated circuits (figure 2, element 18), each of which has nozzles formed therein (figure 3, element 42) for delivering printing fluid onto a first surface of print media, a nozzle guard partially covering the nozzles [0066] (the capping devices cover the nozzles sometimes, and at other times they do not cover the capping devices), and a support member (figure 2, element 28) supporting and carrying the printing fluid for the at least two printhead integrated circuits (figure 2, element 18) and; a media guide for printing without making direct contact with the printhead integrated circuits (column 3, lines 6-10).

As per claim 2: a print media guide is arranged to substantially prevent the print media from impinging on the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits.

As per claim 3: the print media guide is arranged to provide a gap between the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits and the passing print media.

As per claim 4: a printhead assembly (10) wherein: the at least one printhead module (figure 2, element 12) is formed as a unitary arrangement of the at least two printhead integrated circuits (figure 2, element 18), the support member (figure 2, element 28), at least one fluid distribution member mounting the at least two printhead integrated circuits to the support member (figure 7, element 30), and an electrical connector for connecting electrical signals to the at least two printhead integrated circuit chips; the support member has at least one longitudinally extending channel (figure 8, element 72) for carrying the printing fluid for the printhead integrated circuits and includes a plurality of apertures (figure 8, element 72) extending through a wall of the support member arranged so as to direct the printing fluid from the at least one channel to associated nozzles in both, or if more than two, all of the printhead integrated circuits by way of respective ones of the fluid distribution members (column 4, lines 41-44).

Silverbrook et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: a casing in which the at least one printhead module is removably mounted a print media guide mounted to a slanted portion of the casing immediately adjacent the printhead module, a slanted print media contact surface of the print media guide arranged to contact and guide the print media across the nozzles of the printhead module for printing onto the first surface.

As per claim 2: a print media guide is arranged to substantially prevent the print media from impinging on the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits.

As per claim 3: the print media guide is arranged to provide a gap between the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits and the passing print media.


Silverbrook (834) discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: a casing in which the at least one printhead module is removably mounted a print media guide mounted to a slanted portion of the casing immediately adjacent the printhead module, a slanted print media contact surface of the print media guide arranged to contact and guide the print media across the nozzles of the printhead module for printing onto the first surface (shown below).

As per claim 2: a print media guide is arranged to substantially prevent the print media from impinging on the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits (see figure below – media guide and rollers put pressure on paper so that it rests against the media guide and not the nozzle area).

As per claim 3: the print media guide is arranged to provide a gap between the nozzles of each of the at least two printhead integrated circuits and the passing print media (see figure below – media guide and rollers put pressure on paper so that it rests against the media guide and not the nozzle area).

Art Unit: 2853



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Silverbrook et al. with that of Silverbrook (834) in order to improve image quality and consistency.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura E. Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. E. M./

Laura E. Martin

/Manish S. Shah/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2853